

Appendix H

Relationship to Plans and Policies

APPENDIX H

RELATIONSHIP TO PLANS AND POLICIES

The following tables summarize the relationship of the proposed alternatives to the specific policies in the plans and policies affecting Population and Employment, Land Use, Housing and Urban Design in the City of Seattle.

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT PLANS AND POLICIES

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL: ADOPTED MULTICOUNTY FRAMEWORK GOALS AND POLICIES				
<i>Economics</i> RE-7 Foster economic opportunity and stability, promote economic well being, and encourage economic vitality and family wage jobs while managing growth. Support effective and efficient mobility for people, freight, and goods that are consistent with the region's growth and transportation strategy. Maintain region-wide information about past and present economic performance. Assess future economic conditions that could affect the central Puget Sound region.	L			<p>All alternatives would accommodate continued economic growth. Alternatives 1 and 2 would provide the greatest amount of additional commercial development capacity in the office core (DOC 1 and 2 zones), and Alternative 3 somewhat less of an increase in capacity in the DOC 2 zone. This increased capacity would accommodate future commercial activities that generate economic growth and jobs.</p> <p>The alternatives have differing transportation impact implications, but would be generally consistent with the region's growth and transportation strategies that emphasize growth in established urban centers and regional transit and road system improvements.</p>
KING COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES				
<i>Economic Development</i> FW-33 All jurisdictions shall contribute to the economic sustainability of the County in a manner that supports the Countywide land use pattern. This is to be accomplished by providing cost-efficient quality infrastructure and public services at an adopted level-of-service specific to the local situation, providing affordable housing, promoting excellence in education, and protecting the environment.	L			<p>All alternatives would generally contribute to the economic sustainability of King County in a manner consistent with preferred countywide land use patterns. Additional growth accommodated by the alternatives would generate additional public infrastructure and service needs, affordable housing and environmental impacts. In general, additional growth in the central Downtown area would aid in the efficiency of infrastructure, utilities, services and housing provision, and would have fewer environmental impact implications than an equivalent amount of development in suburban and suburban fringe areas.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>FW-35 All jurisdictions shall support the development of a regional economic development strategy consistent with the Countywide land use pattern.</p> <p>Strengthen, Expand, and Diversify the Economy</p> <p>ED-6 Local jurisdictions' plans shall include policies that actively support the retention and expansion of the economic base of the multi-County region. Local jurisdictions and the County shall work cooperatively on a regional basis and invite private sector participation to evaluate the trends, opportunities and weaknesses of the existing economy and to analyze the economic needs of key industries.</p> <p>Local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans shall include policies intended to foster:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The development and retention of those businesses and industries which export their goods and services outside the region. These businesses and industries are critical to the economic strength and diversification of the economy; and A business climate which is supportive of business formation, expansion, and retention and recognizes the importance of small businesses in creating new jobs. 	<p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>All alternatives would fit within the overall regional economic development strategy. Alternatives 1 and 2 would provide the greatest additional capacity for growth, and Alternative 3 somewhat less capacity for economic growth, in a manner that is consistent with regional land use goals.</p> <p>As noted above, the alternatives would provide additional capacity in Downtown for more commercial activities that contribute to economic growth. The proposed capacity increases can be interpreted as a strategy to strengthen, expand and diversify the economy. The alternatives generally encourage a wide range of economic opportunities because zoning would accommodate a variety of different building types and arrangements serving a variety of activities from small-scale retail to larger-scale office and high-tech or research & development activities.</p>
SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: TOWARD A SUSTAINABLE SEATTLE				
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p>Distribution of Growth</p> <p>The Plan sets residential and employment growth targets for Urban Centers and Hub Urban Villages. The greatest share of employment growth and residential growth (65% and 45%, respectively) is to be accommodated within Urban Centers. This will help meet the minimum density criteria set by the King County Countywide Planning Policies, use available development capacity in these areas, and contribute to the achievement of the desired land use pattern.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan's growth targets for 1994-2014 are an additional 62,700 jobs and 14,700 households.</p> <p>Economic Development Element</p> <p>The Economic Development Element encourages growth of a broad mix of jobs, especially family-wage jobs, and supports the City's target of adding 131,000-146,600 jobs over 20 years. Also, it encourages</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>The alternatives would provide additional capacity in the Downtown Urban Center for long-term employment and residential growth toward established targets. The pattern of growth under any alternative would be consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Increasing the capacity of Downtown for future employment growth would be consistent with economic development goals of maintaining a positive business</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
actions that support a positive business climate and ensure that the infrastructure needed to support the economy is in place.				climate and accommodating family-wage job growth. This EIS analyzes the potential infrastructure impacts of the alternatives (see the Transportation, Energy and Water and Sewer Utility sections for further discussion). The city's business climate and economic performance ultimately will be affected by how these issues are addressed.
<i>Downtown Urban Center Goals and Policies</i> <u>Economic Development Goals</u> Policy DT-EP1 Promote development consistent with [the Comprehensive Plan]. Consider the impact on economic development in the planning of major public projects and consider public actions to facilitate development. Where possible, encourage private sector cooperation in implementing actions such as training and employment for target population groups.	£	£		The alternatives would promote further economic development of the Downtown Urban Center, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The alternatives do not address special provisions for training or employment of target population groups.
<i>Bellevue Goals and Policies</i> Policy B-P3 Develop methods to integrate and stabilize the current population, respect neighborhood character and serve as a catalyst for the rest of the planning objective.		£		The alternatives contain different sets of changes that would accommodate existing population as well as additional growth, and act as a catalyst for other planning objectives. The alternatives would have varying degrees of impact on existing neighborhood character.

HOUSING PLANS AND POLICIES

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL, ADOPTED MULTICOUNTY FRAMEWORK GOALS AND POLICIES				
<i>Housing</i> RH-4 Provide a variety of choices in housing types to meet the needs of all segments of the population. Achieve and sustain an adequate supply of low-income, moderate-income and special needs housing located throughout the region.	£			The alternatives are intended to aid in achieving housing for all segments of the population. See the Housing section for further discussion.
KING COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL, COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES				
<i>Human and Community Services</i> CC-4 Human and community service planning activities shall support Countywide Planning Policies and the Countywide land development pattern.		£		Existing Downtown development regulations include methods of addressing human and community service demands generated by future development. The alternatives only peripherally relate to this policy in that additional development capacity would be created by Alternatives 1, 2 and 3.

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>CC-5 All jurisdictions shall identify essential community and human services and include them in land use, capital improvement, and transportation plans.</p> <p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>FW-28 All jurisdictions shall provide for a diversity of housing types to meet a variety of needs and provide for housing opportunities for all economic segments of the population. All jurisdictions shall cooperatively establish a process to ensure an equitable and rational distribution of low-income and affordable housing throughout the County in accordance with land use policies, transportation, and employment locations.</p> <p>AH-1 All jurisdictions shall plan for housing to meet the needs of all economic segments of the population. Each jurisdiction shall specify, based on the projected number of net new housing units anticipated in its comprehensive plan, the estimated number of units which will be affordable for the following income segments: Zero to 50% of the Countywide median household income, 50 to 80% of median, 80 to 120% of median, and above 120% of median. The estimates for housing affordable to households below 80% of median-income shall be consistent with Countywide objectives for low and moderate income housing in policy AH-2. The estimated number of units for each income segment shall be reported to the Growth Management Planning Council following adoption of the comprehensive plan, for the purpose of Countywide monitoring of capacity for housing development.</p> <p>Within the Urban Growth Area, each jurisdiction shall demonstrate its ability to accommodate sufficient, affordable housing for all economic segments of the population. Local actions may include zoning land for development of sufficient densities, revising development standards and permitting procedures as needed to encourage affordable housing, reviewing codes for redundancies and inconsistencies, and providing opportunities for a range of housing types, such as accessory dwelling units, manufactured homes, group homes and foster care facilities, apartments, townhouses and attached single family housing.</p> <p>AH-2 All jurisdictions shall share the responsibility for achieving a rational and equitable distribution of affordable housing to meet the housing needs of low and moderate-income residents in King County. The distribution of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households shall take into consideration the need for proximity to lower wage employment, access to transportation and human</p>	<p></p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>£</p>	<p></p>	<p>Same response as above.</p> <p>All alternatives would assist with the creation of new housing for a range of income groups within Downtown Seattle, consistent with land use and transportation policies and in close proximity to employment.</p> <p>See the Housing section for discussion of the number of new units that could be built in Downtown Seattle at income levels below 80% of median income. This EIS will contribute to the City's understanding of its ability to accommodate sufficient affordable housing for all economic segments of the population.</p> <p>All alternatives would create opportunities for additional affordable housing in close proximity to employment, transportation networks and human services. See the Transportation, Energy, Sewer and Water sections of this EIS for discussion of the adequacy of infrastructure to accommodate housing.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>services, and the adequacy of infrastructure to support housing development; recognize each jurisdiction's past and current efforts to provide housing affordable to low and moderate-income households; avoid over-concentration of assisted housing; and increase housing opportunities and choices for low and moderate-income households in communities throughout King County. Each jurisdiction shall give equal consideration to local and Countywide housing needs.</p> <p><u>A. Existing Needs for Affordable Housing</u> Each jurisdiction shall participate in developing Countywide housing resources and programs to assist the large number of low and moderate-income households who currently do not have affordable, appropriate housing. These Countywide efforts will help reverse current trends which concentrate low-income housing opportunities in certain communities, and achieve a more equitable participation by local jurisdictions in low income housing development and services. Countywide efforts should give priority to assisting households below 50% of median-income that are in greatest need and communities with high proportions of low and moderate income residents.</p> <p>...Countywide programs should provide the following types of housing and related services:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low-income housing development, including new construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation; 2. Housing assistance, such as rental vouchers and supportive services; 3. Assistance to expand the capacity of nonprofit organizations to develop housing and provide housing related services; 4. Programs to assist homeless individuals and families; 5. Programs to prevent homelessness; and 6. Assistance to low and moderate-income home buyers. <p><u>B. Future Needs for Affordable Housing</u> Each jurisdiction shall specify the range and amount of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households to be accommodated in its comprehensive plan. Each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes between 50 and 80% of the County median household income that is equal to 17 percent of its projected net household growth. In addition, each jurisdiction shall plan for a number of housing units affordable to households with incomes below 50% of median income that is either 20% or 24% of its projected net household growth. For this housing, the target percentage shall be determined using the</p>				<p>All alternatives would assist in developing housing to assist low-income housing opportunities. Both the programs studied under this EIS and other City programs assist in providing the services described.</p> <p>All alternatives would support existing incentive programs for the creation of low-income housing.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>Affordable Housing Job/Housing Index developed using Census-based information, which is contained in Appendix 3. Each jurisdiction shall show in its comprehensive plan how it will use policies, incentives, regulations and programs to provide its share of housing affordable to low and moderate-income households. Each jurisdiction should apply strategies which it determines to be most appropriate to the local housing market. For example, units affordable to low and moderate income households may be developed through new construction, projects that assure long-term affordability of existing housing, or accessory housing units added to existing structures.</p> <p>Local actions may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifying the costs to develop and preserve subsidized housing and other low-cost housing not provided by private development in the local housing market, and identifying sources of funding; 2. Revising land use regulations as needed to remove any unreasonable requirements that may create barriers to siting and operating housing for special needs groups. Special needs housing serves persons, who, by virtue of disability or other circumstances, face difficulty living independently and require supportive services on a transitional or long-term basis; and 3. Adopting land use incentives programs or other regulatory measures to encourage private and nonprofit development 4. Small, fully built cities and towns that are not planned to grow substantially under Growth Management Act may work cooperatively with other jurisdictions and/or subregional housing agencies to meet their housing targets. In areas identified as city expansion areas, King County and cities should plan cooperatively for affordable housing development and preservation. <p>AH-3 Each jurisdiction shall evaluate its existing resources of subsidized and low-cost non-subsidized housing and identify housing that may be lost due to redevelopment, deteriorating housing conditions, or public policies or actions. Where feasible, each jurisdiction shall develop strategies to preserve existing low-income housing and provide relocation assistance to low-income residents who may be displaced.</p> <p><i>Regional Finance and Governance</i></p> <p><u>Finance and Governance Plans</u></p> <p>RF-3 All jurisdictions shall adopt policies to stimulate construction or preservation of affordable housing in Centers, infill and redevelopment areas.</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>See the Housing section of this EIS. Under all alternatives, some existing housing may be lost to redevelopment. The amount of housing that could be lost would not change by alternative. The City currently has programs in place to preserve existing housing and provide relocation assistance to low-income tenants.</p> <p>See responses above.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN				
<p>Housing Element</p> <p>The Housing Element of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan has 17 goals and 48 policies addressing the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodating growth and maintaining affordability; Encouraging housing diversity and quality; and Providing housing affordable to low-income households. <p>The goals and policies most pertinent to the proposal are discussed below.</p>	£			The alternatives appear to be consistent with the overall direction of housing policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan.
<p>Goal HG4 Achieve a mix of housing types attractive and affordable to a diversity of ages, incomes, household types, household sizes, and cultural backgrounds.</p>	£			See the response to FW-28, above.
<p>Goal HG14 Preserve existing low-income housing, particularly in urban centers and urban villages where most redevelopment pressure will occur.</p>	£			See the response to FW-28, above.
<p>Policy H2 Maintain sufficient zoned development capacity to accommodate Seattle's projected share of King County household growth over the next 20 years as provided for and described in the Land Use Element.</p>	£			The alternatives would provide additional development capacity that would aid in accommodating future residential growth for more than 20 years.
<p>Policy H8 Consider using zoning, land use regulations and policies, and infrastructure requirements for, among other objectives, providing incentives that encourage public agencies, private property owners and developers to build housing that helps fulfill City policy objectives for housing. [Examples of development incentives: height and density bonuses, minimum densities and transferable development rights.]</p>	£			The alternatives are examples of zoning and regulatory changes intended to further encourage private owners, developers and public agencies to build additional housing and help fulfill City policy objectives for housing. This EIS analyzes the varying degrees of impacts that the alternatives would have on land use and housing.
<p>Policy H30 Promote the continued production and preservation of low-income housing through existing incentive zoning mechanisms, which include density and height bonuses and the transfer of development rights...Allow for new or different incentive zoning provisions designed to produce or preserve low-income housing in Downtown if they are adopted as part of neighborhood or subarea plans or where needed to achieve housing development goals.</p>	£			All alternatives would continue to promote the production and preservation of low-income housing through existing incentive zoning mechanisms.
<p>Policy H33 Encourage affordable housing citywide... C) Encourage the production of housing affordable to households of all incomes, with particular emphasis on households with incomes from 0-50% of median income in centers and villages with high land values and/or relatively little existing rental housing</p>	£			All alternatives would continue to support the production of housing affordable to households with incomes from 0%-50% of median income in the Downtown Urban Center, a center with high land values. The Downtown neighborhood would continue to

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>affordable to households with incomes from 0-50% of median income.</p> <p>D) Encourage all neighborhoods and urban villages to participate in the City's commitment to affordable housing, whether through neighborhood planning, station area planning, or other local planning and development activities.</p> <p><i>Downtown Urban Center Goals and Policies</i></p> <p><u>Downtown Housing Affordability Goals</u></p> <p>Policy DT-HP1 Address the desired balance of housing affordable to the full range of household income levels through a collaborative effort between the City and Downtown neighborhoods. Seek to achieve the Downtown Urban Center housing growth target and goals for the number and affordability of Downtown housing units in the adopted policies of the Downtown neighborhood plans.</p> <p>Balance adopted neighborhood plan goals to achieve overall housing goals for Downtown. Consider these goals as the City develops and implements housing programs and as City funds and other public resources are distributed. Promote the maintenance and preservation of housing affordable to low- and low-moderate income households.</p> <p><u>Housing Development</u></p> <p>Policy DT-HP2 To strive to achieve an adequate balance in employment and housing activity and to meet Downtown housing goals, promote public and private actions for developing a significant supply of affordable Downtown housing to help meet demand generated by Downtown employment growth.</p> <p><i>Public/Private Partnerships</i></p> <p>Work with Downtown neighborhoods, businesses, and public and non-profit organizations to meet Downtown housing goals, especially with regard to implementing programs to develop and maintain affordable housing units.</p> <p><i>Light Rail Station Area Development</i></p> <p>Review all light rail station area development plans to identify opportunities for high-density transportation efficient housing in these areas and to address potential impacts on existing housing resources.</p> <p>Policies DT-HP3 through 7 address other housing-related topics including:</p> <p>Use of housing bonuses to encourage provision of housing for households with incomes 0 to 80 percent of the regional median income.</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>participate in the City's commitment to affordable housing.</p> <p>This EIS responds to neighborhood interest in achieving the desired balance of housing affordable to the full range of income levels. The housing growth target for Downtown Seattle could be achieved under any of the alternatives.</p> <p>All alternatives would continue to support public and private actions for developing affordable housing to meet demand generated by employment growth.</p> <p>The alternatives would promote future development (largely by the private sector) of additional housing Downtown, including in affordable categories.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would increase allowable height and density in areas near the Convention Center bus/light rail station, generally supporting the concept of denser development at and near high-capacity transportation stations.</p> <p>All alternatives would support these policies. Housing bonuses would continue to encourage the provision of housing for households in the 0% to 80% income range. New development using the housing</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>Promotion of new development serving households of mixed incomes.</p> <p>Maintaining existing housing resources through use of housing TDR, preservation of federally-assisted housing units, anti-neglect measures, and publicly-supported housing programs.</p> <p>Commercial Core Goals and Policies</p> <p>Policy COM-P4 Seek to provide housing affordable to households with a range of income levels.</p> <p>Denny Triangle Goals and Policies</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Goal DEN-G1 A diverse residential neighborhood with an even distribution of income levels.</p> <p>Policy DEN-P1 Seek an even distribution of household income levels.</p> <p>Policy DEN-P2 Explore the use of bonuses, zoning, TDRs and City investment to encourage housing throughout the Denny Triangle neighborhood.</p> <p>Policy DEN-P3 Maintain a supply of low-income units in the Denny Triangle neighborhood throughout the life of the plan.</p> <p>Belltown Goals and Policies</p> <p>Goal B-G1 A neighborhood where growth provides a varied housing stock and a wide range of affordability</p> <p>Policy B-P4 Support the neighborhood's goals for housing affordability.</p> <p>Policy B-P7 Strive to preserve the existing housing stock, including older buildings, subsidized units, and affordable, unsubsidized units.</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>bonus program would be encouraged to serve a range of incomes, and resources would remain to preserve existing housing.</p> <p>This policy is similar to policies in the City's Comprehensive Plan. See the responses to policies in the Housing Element, above.</p> <p>All alternatives will promote, to some extent, a residential neighborhood with housing for a range of incomes.</p> <p>An even distribution of household income ranges may be achieved in the neighborhood as additional market-rate housing is built in this neighborhood that currently has a high percentage of subsidized units.</p> <p>The alternatives would all continue to support the use bonuses, zoning and TDRs to encourage housing in the Denny Triangle. Alternative 3 would use zoning most effectively to encourage housing, whereas Alternative 1 would eliminate the TDC program that currently encourages housing in the neighborhood.</p> <p>All alternatives will support the retention of existing low-income units in the neighborhood.</p> <p>All alternatives will promote the development of additional housing at a wide range of housing types.</p> <p>All alternatives will support the development of additional affordable housing Downtown.</p> <p>All alternatives would support existing tools to preserve the existing housing stock.</p>

LAND USE PLANS AND POLICIES

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL: ADOPTED MULTICOUNTY FRAMEWORK GOALS AND POLICIES				
<i>Urban Growth Areas</i> RG-1 Locate development in urban growth areas to conserve natural resources and enable efficient provision of services and facilities. Within urban growth areas, focus growth in compact communities and centers in a manner that uses land efficiently, provides parks and recreation areas, is pedestrian-oriented, and helps strengthen communities. Connect and serve urban communities with an efficient, transit-oriented, multimodal transportation system.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Alternatives with more development capacity would contribute to greater efficiencies and would also generate additional transit and park/recreation demands.
<i>Contiguous and Orderly Development</i> RC-2 Coordinate provision of necessary public facilities and service to support development and to implement local and regional growth planning objectives. Provide public facilities and services in a manner that is efficient, cost-effective, and conserves resources. Emphasize interjurisdictional planning to coordinate plans and implementation activities and to achieve consistency.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Alternatives with more development capacity in the established Downtown Urban Center would contribute to greater efficiencies, facilities demands and resource conservation.
<i>Open Space, Resource Protection and Critical Areas</i> RO-6 Use rural and urban open space to separate and delineate urban areas and to create a permanent regional greenspace network. Protect critical areas, conserve natural resources, and preserve lands and resources of regional significance.	£		£	Alternative 1 would compromise the usefulness of the Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) program meant to help preserve rural lands by transferring density to Denny Triangle area projects. Alternative 2 would significantly reduce the area usable for TDC. Alternative 3 would have less impact on TDC than Alternatives 1 or 2. Alternative 4 (No Action) would maintain the current status of the TDC program.
<i>Additional Adopted Multicounty Policies Related to Regional Guidelines and Principles</i>				
<u>Concentration of economic activity</u> RE-7.6 Promote economic opportunity by encouraging employment growth in all centers, and foster strength and sustainability by supporting centers-based economic strategies identified in local comprehensive plans and countywide planning policies.	£			All alternatives are consistent. The proposal emphasizes the economic prominence of the Downtown Urban Center.
<u>Residential density</u> RG-1.9 Encourage growth in compact, well-defined urban centers which: 1. enable residents to live near jobs and urban	£			All alternatives are consistent. The alternatives promote additional residential development within the Downtown Urban

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>activities;</p> <p>2. help strengthen existing communities; and</p> <p>3. promote bicycling, walking and transit use through sufficient density and mix of land uses.</p> <p>Connect and serve urban centers by a fast and convenient regional transit system. Provide service between centers and nearby areas by an efficient, transit-oriented, multi-modal transportation system.</p> <p>RG-1.10 Provide opportunities for creation of town centers in urban areas that:</p> <p>1. serve as focal points for neighborhoods and major activity areas;</p> <p>2. include a mix of land uses, such as pedestrian-oriented commercial, transit stops, recreation and housing; and</p> <p>3. encourage transit use, biking and walking through design and land use density.</p>	<p>Ⓛ</p>			<p>Center. Alternative 3 suggests a somewhat different zoning approach than the other alternatives, by promoting zoning that would encourage residential uses in some peripheral areas of Downtown.</p> <p>All alternatives are consistent. The alternatives include various zoning changes meant to encourage positive forms and patterns of urban development in the neighborhoods of Downtown.</p>
KING COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES				
<p><u>Land Use Pattern</u></p> <p><u>Rural Areas</u></p> <p>LU-14 King County may allow transfer of density from Rural Area properties to other Rural or Urban Area properties in order to</p> <p>1. secure a substantial dedication of significant land to the King County Open Space System;</p> <p>2. provide a permanent protection which is greater than that available through existing regulation to a significant natural resource; or</p> <p>3. encourage retention of resource-based uses in the Rural Area.</p> <p>The County shall develop a mechanism to accomplish these objectives and provide that:</p> <p>1. Lands dedicated are first determined to be suitable for inclusion within the King County Open Space System;</p> <p>2. The protected natural resource is first determined to be of significance to King County citizens and the protection afforded is materially superior to that provided by existing regulations;</p> <p>3. The resulting development is located in proximity to the lands to be dedicated to public ownership or where it can otherwise be shown that the residents of this development will share in an overriding public benefit to be derived from the preservation of the dedicated lands or the protection of the natural resource;</p> <p>4. The resulting development within the Rural Area maintains rural character; and</p> <p>5. There shall be no net increase in density within the Rural Area as a result of this density transfer.</p>	<p>Ⓛ</p>		<p>Ⓛ</p>	<p>As noted above in the response to RO-6, each of the alternatives except Alternative 4 (No Action) would negatively affect the usefulness of the TDC program that encourages preservation of rural lands in King County through transfers of density to the Denny Triangle vicinity. Alternative 3 would have less overall impact on TDC than Alternatives 1 and 2.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
Urban Areas				
FW-11 The land use pattern for King County shall protect the natural environment by reducing the consumption of land and concentrating development. An Urban Growth Area, Rural Areas, and resource lands shall be designated and the necessary implementing regulations adopted. This includes Countywide establishment of a boundary for the Urban Growth Area. Local jurisdictions shall make land use decisions based on the Countywide Planning Policies.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would conceptually reduce pressure for suburban-fringe growth that consumes more land and has greater environmental impacts.
FW-12 The Urban Growth Area shall provide enough land to accommodate future urban development. Policies to phase the provision of urban services and to ensure efficient use of the growth capacity within the Urban Growth Area shall be instituted.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would help assure enough capacity for future growth, and contribute to more efficient use of urban services.
Phasing Development within the Urban Growth Area				
LU-28 Within the Urban Growth Area, growth should be directed as follows: first, to Centers and urbanized areas with existing infrastructure capacity; second, to areas which are already urbanized such that infrastructure improvements can be easily extended; and last, to areas requiring major infrastructure improvements.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within Downtown would be consistent with the urban center emphasis in this policy.
Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers				
FW-14 Within the Urban Growth Area, a limited number of Urban Centers which meet specific criteria established in the Countywide Planning Policies shall be locally designated. Urban Centers shall be characterized by all of the following: 1. Clearly defined geographic boundaries; 2. Intensity/density of land uses sufficient to support effective rapid transit; 3. Pedestrian emphasis within the Center; 4. Emphasis on superior urban design which reflects the local community; 5. Limitations on single-occupancy vehicle usage during peak hours or commute purposes; 6. A broad array of land uses and choices within those uses for employees and residents; 7. Sufficient public open spaces and recreational opportunities; and 8. Uses which provide both daytime and nighttime activities in the Center.	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would be consistent with the emphases in this policy.
FW-16 Urban and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers shall be complemented by the land use pattern outside the Centers but within the Urban Area. This area shall include: urban residential neighborhoods; Activity Areas, business/office parks, and an urban open space network. Within these areas, future		£		The City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning are consistent with this policy. The alternatives would not significantly affect the land use patterns outside the Downtown Urban Center.

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>development shall be limited in scale and intensity to support the Countywide land use and regional transportation plan.</p> <p>Urban Centers Designation Process</p> <p>LU-39 The location and number of Urban Centers in King County were determined through the joint local and Countywide adoption process, based on the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Countywide Planning Policies include specific criteria for Urban Centers; b. Jurisdictions electing to contain an Urban Center provided the Growth Management Planning Council with a statement of commitment describing the city's intent and commitment to meet the Centers' criteria defined in these policies and a timetable for the required Centers Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or identification of existing environmental documentation to be used; and c. The Growth Management Planning Council reviewed the Centers nominated by local jurisdictions consistent with policy FW-1, and the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Center's location in the region and its potential for promoting a Countywide system of Urban Centers; 2. The total number of Centers in the County that can be realized over the next 20 years, based on 20 years projected growth; 3. The type and level of commitments that each jurisdiction has identified for achieving Center goals; and 4. Review of other jurisdictional plans to ensure that growth focused to Centers is assured. d. [The Growth Management Planning Council confirmed the Downtown Seattle Urban Center.] <p>Urban Centers Criteria</p> <p>LU-40 Each jurisdiction which has designated an Urban Center shall adopt in its comprehensive plan a definition of the Urban Center which specifies the exact geographic boundaries of the Center. All Centers shall be up to one and a half square miles of land. Infrastructure and services shall be planned and financed consistent with the expected rate of growth. For the purposes of achieving long-range development pattern that will provide a successful mix of uses and densities that will efficiently support high-capacity transit, each Center shall have planned land uses to accommodate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A minimum of 15,000 jobs within one-half mile of a transit center; b. At a minimum, an average of 50 employees per gross acre; and c. At a minimum, an average of 50 households per 	<p>£</p> <p>£</p>			<p>All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would help support the Urban Centers strategy in this policy.</p> <p>All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would help support the Urban Centers strategy.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
gross acre.				
<p>LU-45 Jurisdictions' comprehensive plans for Urban Centers shall demonstrate compliance with the Urban Centers criteria. In order to promote urban growth within Centers, the Urban Center plan shall establish strategies which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Support pedestrian mobility, bicycle use and transit use; b. Achieve a target housing density and mix of use; c. Provide a wide range of capital improvement projects, such as street improvements, schools, parks and open space, public art and community facilities; d. Emphasize superior urban design; e. Emphasize historic preservation & adaptive reuse of historic places; f. Include other local characteristics necessary to achieve a vital Urban Center; and g. Include facilities to meet human service needs. 	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would help support the Urban Centers strategy.
<p>Incentives for Urban Centers</p> <p>LU-47 and LU-48 Set requirements for the development of: regional funding strategies for Urban Centers and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statements for the Urban Centers, respectively.</p>	£			All alternatives are consistent. This programmatic EIS may contribute to streamlining SEPA obligations for future development, and assist in determining funding strategies for needed improvements.
<p>LU-49 In support of Centers, additional local action should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Strategies for land assembly within the Center, if applicable; b. Infrastructure and service financing strategies and economic development strategies for the Centers; c. Establishing expected permit processing flow commitments consistent with the PEIS; and d. Establishing a streamlined and simplified administrative appeal process with fixed and certain timelines. 	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the Downtown Urban Center would help support the Urban Centers strategy.
<p>LU-50 Jurisdictions should consider additional incentives for development within Urban Centers such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Setting goals for maximum permit review time and give priority to permits in Urban Centers; b. Policies to reduce or eliminate impact fees; c. Simplifying and streamlining of the administrative appeal processes; d. Eliminating project-specific requirements for parking and open space by providing those facilities for the Urban Center as a whole; and e. Establishing a bonus zoning program for the provision of urban amenities. 	£	£		Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would conceptually provide additional incentive for development within the Downtown Urban Center. This area has bonus-oriented zoning already. However, the alternatives have little relationship to the other strategies listed in this policy.
<p>Community Character and Open Space</p> <p>FW-24 All jurisdictions shall support the County's existing diversity of places to live, work and recreate</p>	£			All alternatives are consistent. Providing additional development capacity within the

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>and the ethnic diversity of our communities. The Countywide development pattern shall include sufficient supply of quality places for housing, employment, education, recreation, and open space and the provision of community and social services.</p> <p>FW-25 Each Urban Area shall be characterized by superior urban design as locally defined.</p> <p>Urban Design CC-3 All jurisdictions shall promote a high quality of design and site planning in publicly-funded construction (such as civic buildings, parks, bridges, transit stops), and in private development.</p> <p>Open Space FW-27 All jurisdictions shall cooperatively identify, establish, protect and steward urban and rural open space corridors of regional significance.</p> <p>CC-6 A regional open space system shall be established to include lands which: a. Provide physical and/or visual buffers such as open spaces which help to separate incompatible uses, distinguish the Urban and Rural Areas, define Urban Growth Boundaries, or establish the character of a neighborhood, community, city or region; b. Provide active and passive outdoor recreational opportunities which are compatible with the environmental and ecological values of the site; and/or c. Contain natural areas, habitat lands, natural drainage features, and/or other environmental, cultural, and scenic resources.</p> <p>CC-7 All jurisdictions shall work cooperatively to identify and protect open space corridors of regional significance. This process shall include: a. Identification of regional open space lands and corridors which form a functionally and physically connected system with environmental, ecological, recreational and aesthetic significance and which is readily accessible to our urban populations; b. Identification of implementation strategies and regulatory and non-regulatory techniques to protect the lands and corridors, including collaboration and</p>	<p>Ⓐ</p>	<p>Ⓐ</p> <p>Ⓐ</p> <p>Ⓐ</p> <p>Ⓐ</p>		<p>Downtown Urban Center would generally support the housing, employment and community/social service aims of this policy. See the Land Use and Housing sections for additional discussion.</p> <p>All alternatives are consistent. See the urban design/aesthetic analyses in this EIS for further discussion of the relative impacts of the alternatives.</p> <p>The alternatives have only a limited relationship to the quality of design and site planning for individual projects. However, the alternatives would allow different scales of development in various portions of Downtown. See the Land Use, urban design and aesthetic analyses in this EIS for further discussion of the relative impacts of the alternatives.</p> <p>The alternatives have little if any direct relationship to urban or rural open space corridors of regional significance. However, the alternatives (except No Action) would have varying impacts on the viability of the TDC program that aids in rural land preservation.</p> <p>Same response as above.</p> <p>Same response as above.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>coordination with land trusts and other land preservation organizations; and</p> <p>c. Development of management plans and strategies to sustain the corridors' open space benefits and functions of the preserved lands and corridors.</p> <p>CC-8 Water bodies and rivers of the Puget Sound region form an important element of the open space system. Jurisdictions shall work to protect visual access to water bodies and rivers, and provide for physical access where appropriate.</p> <p>CC-10 The conceptual map of open space systems contained in the 1988 King County Open Space Plan shall be used as the planning basis for regional open space lands and corridors. All jurisdictions will work cooperatively to revise and supplement this map to direct the protection of these valuable resources throughout the County.</p> <p>CC-11 All jurisdictions shall work cooperatively to ensure parks and open spaces are provided as development and redevelopment occur.</p> <p>CC-12 All jurisdictions shall use the full range of regulatory and land preservation tools available to create, maintain and steward the regional open space system which has been cooperatively identified.</p> <p>CC-13 All jurisdictions shall develop coordinated level-of-service standards for the provision of parks and open spaces.</p>		<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>		<p>The alternatives would have varying aesthetic/ view impacts related to building bulk, but would not prevent reasonable visual and physical access to water bodies and rivers, as addressed in this policy.</p> <p>See the response to FW-27 above.</p> <p>The alternatives do not explicitly address parks and open spaces, but neighborhood plans and code requirements address envisioned park/open space improvements. See the Pedestrian Amenities/Open Space section for further discussion.</p> <p>See the response to FW-27 above.</p> <p>See the response to FW-27 above.</p>
SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: TOWARD A SUSTAINABLE SEATTLE				
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p><u>Preferred Development Pattern - Urban Village strategy</u></p> <p>The "Urban Village strategy" is the main organizing theme of the City's land use planning in the Comprehensive Plan. Rather than dispersed growth along arterials or spread throughout the single-family residential areas of the city, this strategy favors concentration of a majority of growth in the few larger urban centers and the more widespread urban villages. The intent is to accommodate growth by building on successful aspects of the city's existing urban character, continuing the development of concentrated, pedestrian friendly mixed-use urban villages of varied intensities at appropriate locations throughout the city. The urban village strategy is intended to aid in delivery of infrastructure and services, foster a development pattern that is more</p>	£			<p>All alternatives are consistent. The intent to encourage compact mixed-use growth in Urban Centers, and emphasis on a strong Downtown Urban Center are well-established. Many of the objectives and benefits of this strategy will be achieved over a long period of time, probably beyond even 2020. This EIS contributes to an understanding of the relationship of the alternatives to the City's Comprehensive Plan and other goals and policies.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>pedestrians and transit users, to support urban villages.</p> <p>Land Use Regulations—Land Use Map—Downtown Area</p> <p>Goal LG 51 indicates, “Accommodate within Downtown areas the broadest mix of activities and greatest intensity of development in the region.”</p> <p>Goal LG 77 echoes this except it advises “promoting” this land use pattern.</p> <p>Policy L61 associated with this goal indicates, “Promote the continued economic vitality of the Downtown, with particular attention to the retail core, and encouragement of hospitality uses.”</p> <p>Policies L 258-260 define Downtown zones, the primary land use functions, and call for inclusion of an open space requirement. The land use functions include office, retail, mixed-use commercial, mixed-use residential, harborfront and industrial.</p> <p>Open Space Network</p> <p>This section of the Land Use Element describes the City’s overall goals and policies for provision of open space throughout the city. It supports availability of open space for passive and active recreational uses, as an amenity in denser populated areas, to protect the environment, for shoreline access, and to facilitate bicycling and walking.</p> <p>Policy L296 indicates, “Maximize the potential of the street system for public use through the reclamation of portions of public right-of-way, where appropriate, for open space, waterfront access, tree planting and substantial landscaping, pedestrian amenities, recreation space, view corridors and boulevards.”</p> <p>Policy L299 states, “Consider open space provisions identified in adopted neighborhood plans, including specific open space sites and features, in guiding the expansion of the open space network.</p> <p>Policy L300 states, in part, expansion of the open space network should consider locations for new facilities in “urban villages targeted for largest share of residential growth; especially those existing high density residential areas presently not served according to the population-based or distribution goals</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>other regulations and policies, help preserve historically significant elements of Downtown. Given these protections, no significant adverse impacts on these resources are anticipated.</p> <p>The proposed provision of additional height and density would contribute to the continued economic vitality of Downtown by accommodating a greater amount of long-term commercial and residential growth than under current zoning.</p> <p>These alternatives would not directly affect the retail core; it may aid in accommodating growth in hospitality uses, given the proximity of some affected areas to the retail core and convention center areas that attract many visitors.</p> <p>These alternatives would affect the Downtown Office Core and Downtown Mixed Commercial zones. Dominant uses in these areas will include office, retail and other commercial uses, as well as mixed-use structures including residences.</p> <p>The alternatives do not explicitly address parks and open spaces, but neighborhood plans and code requirements address required and envisioned park/open space improvements. See the Open Space discussion in Chapter 3.</p> <p>Encouraging future development would encourage the achievement of pedestrian/ open space improvements (such as Green Streets) in the affected areas, consistent with neighborhood plans. See the Land Use section for further discussion.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
for urban village open space.”				
<p><i>Downtown Urban Center Goals and Policies</i></p> <p>This section, beginning on page NP-55 of the Comprehensive Plan, is the current version of Downtown Land Use Policies. Prior versions of these policies were included by reference in the Land Use Code, and were based on the prior 1984 <i>Downtown Land Use and Transportation Plan</i>.</p> <p>The text defines 13 goals, addressing these themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> X <u>Pre-eminent Regional Center</u> – Maintaining Downtown Seattle as the pre-eminent regional urban center, compactly developed and supporting a diversity of uses. X <u>Economic Development</u> – Encouraging economic development. X <u>Culture and Entertainment</u> – Reinforcing Downtown as a cultural and entertainment center. X <u>Urban Form</u> – Seeking to enhance the physical form of Downtown. X <u>Land Use Patterns</u> – Accommodating future office, retail, residential and commercial mixed-use areas in ways that build upon the existing urban form, according to concept maps on pages NP-58 and 59 of the Comprehensive Plan. X <u>Shorelines</u> – Revitalizing the Harborfront areas. X <u>Transportation</u> - Supporting transportation improvements that complement and reinforce desired land use patterns, and encourage transit and pedestrian travel. X <u>Housing</u> – Seeking to expand housing opportunities in Downtown for people of all income levels, including affordable housing opportunities. X <u>Child Care and Human Services</u> – Addressing the increased demand for child care and other human services generated by increased employment growth Downtown. X <u>Public Safety</u> – Promoting public safety by encouraging well-designed streets and active public places. X <u>Neighborhood</u> – Seeking to enhance the varied character of Downtown neighborhoods. <p>Following the goals, the text contains numerous policies that are the fundamental policy basis for the regulations in the Land Use Code and other codes. The policy topics most relevant to this proposal are summarized below.</p> <p><u>Land Use District Function</u></p> <p><u>Policy DT-LUP4</u></p> <p><u>DOC1</u> – Area of most concentrated activity. The DOC-1 land use district is intended to:</p>	<p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p>	<p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p>		<p>All alternatives are consistent.</p> <p>These goals are consistent with the goals of the citywide urban village strategy, and provide somewhat more specific goals for the Downtown Urban Center. The goals support continuing and improving vitality, urban character, mixing of uses, housing opportunities for all income levels, safe conditions, a good transportation system, and better delivery of human services in the Downtown area.</p> <p>See the Land Use section for further discussion of impacts and relationship to plans and policies.</p>
	Ⓛ			The alternatives would continue the role of the DOC 1 zone as the area of most

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>a. Allow the highest density of commercial development Downtown, with development standards regulating building design to reduce adverse impacts, including impacts on sidewalks and other public areas;</p> <p>b. Accommodate a large share of Downtown's future employment growth within this district where the existing and planned infrastructure can accommodate growth; and</p> <p>c. Accommodate other uses, including housing, retail, hotels and cultural and entertainment facilities, that complement the primary office function while adding diversity and activity beyond the working day.</p> <p><u>DOC 2</u>—Areas adjacent to the office core appropriate for office expansion and where a transition in density to mixed use areas is desirable. The DOC 2 land use district is intended to:</p> <p>a. Accommodate major office development to reduce pressures for such development in the retail core and adjacent mixed use and residential areas.</p> <p>b. Accommodate a mix of other activities, in addition to primary office use, to add diversity, particularly beyond the hours of the normal working day, while providing for scale and density transitions to adjacent areas.</p> <p><u>DMC</u>—Areas adjacent to the office core, office expansion areas and retail core that provide a transition in the level of activity and scale of development. Areas designated DMC are characterized by a diversity of uses. The DMC land use district is intended to:</p> <p>a. Permit office and commercial use, but at lower densities than in the office areas;</p> <p>b. Encourage housing and other uses generating activity without substantially contributing to peak hour traffic; and</p> <p>c. Promote development diversity and compatibility with adjacent areas through a range of height limits.</p> <p>Locational Criteria</p> <p>Policy DT-LUP5 Apply district designations, as appropriate, to create or reinforce areas with distinctive functions and to provide desirable transitions between areas with different functions and levels of activity. Use the following locational criteria to guide establishing the district boundaries that define areas according to intended function:</p> <p><i>Scale and Character of Development.</i> ...Employ development standards that respect established patterns, both in physical scale and in nature of activity; or provide direction for the scale and character of future development to create the desired physical environment in some parts of Downtown where it is</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>		<p>£</p> <p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>concentrated activity with the highest permitted commercial densities. All of the alternatives support continued emphasis of DOC 1 as the highest density commercial core of Downtown. Building design would continue to be regulated in order to reduce impacts on sidewalks and other public areas. Other uses would continue to be accommodated in this area.</p> <p>The alternatives would be generally consistent with the purposes of the DOC 2 zone, as described in this section. The alternatives would accommodate and likely encourage major office development in the DOC 2 zone, and would accommodate the intent for a mix of other diverse uses. The Land Use, Height/Bulk/Scale and Housing sections further discuss the potential for impacts from future development patterns.</p> <p>The alternatives address DMC zones in different ways. Alternative 1 seeks relatively large proportional increases in allowable height and density, compared to the existing allowable height and density. Alternatives 2 and 4 propose no changes to DMC zones. Alternative 3 would encourage housing and development diversity in a way generally consistent with this policy. See the Land Use, Height/Bulk/ Scale and Housing sections for further discussion of potential impacts.</p> <p>The alternatives propose different levels of changes, primarily to provide direction for the scale and character of future development to create the physical environment desired for portions of Downtown such as the Denny Triangle.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would create the greatest difference between the existing development and zoned capacity. This would generate more potential for height, bulk and scale impacts and transportation impacts than the other alternatives. Alternatives 2 and 3 limit the proposed changes to fewer areas and/or</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>appropriate to accommodate significant change.</p> <p><i>Transportation and Infrastructure Capacity.</i> Consider locations where the existing and planned transportation network can support additional trips generated by new development.</p> <p><i>Relationship to Surrounding Activity.</i> Consider relationships among major areas as a major factor in establishing land use district boundaries, including both well defined edges, such as I-5 or significant topographic changes, that clearly distinguish one area from another, as well as more subtle transitions resulting from a gradual change in use or development intensity.</p> <p>Land Use District Density</p> <p>Policy DT LUP8 Generally limit the density of uses that generate employment through a floor area ratio (FAR), and the density of residential uses generally through the combination of height and bulk regulations.</p> <p>Apply a base and maximum limit on permitted density, as expressed by a floor area ratio (FAR), in areas able to accommodate more intensive development provided that impacts associated with the added density are addressed. Reflect in the base FAR limit the City will accommodate without additional mitigation measures.</p> <p>Reflect in the maximum FAR limit the additional density above the base that may be allowed through bonuses or TDR, or both, as appropriate for the zone or district, if appropriate measures are taken to mitigate specified impacts.</p> <p>Consider density incentives to encourage development on smaller lots to add diversity to the scale of development in high density office core areas.</p> <p><i>Floor Area Limit Exemptions.</i> Allow exemptions from floor area ratio limits to recognize the lower impacts of certain uses and encourage certain uses that generate minimal peak period commute trips, support pedestrian activity and transit use, and contribute to the overall diversity of activity Downtown, increasing its attractiveness as a place to live, work, and recreate.</p> <p>Building Height</p> <p>Policy DT-UDP4 Regulate the height of new development generally to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accommodate desired densities of uses and communicate the intensity and character of development in different parts of Downtown; Protect the light, air and human scale qualities of the street environment, particularly in areas of 	<p>Ⓛ</p> <p>Ⓛ</p>			<p>lesser levels of change. Alternative 4 is the No Action alternative.</p> <p>See the Land Use, Height/Bulk/Scale and Transportation sections for further discussion of impacts.</p> <p>Same response as above.</p> <p>The alternatives differ in the relative intensity of use and transitions that are communicated by the proposed height limits, particularly in the Denny Triangle vicinity. Alternative 1 proposes the greatest increase in height (100 feet) in DMC zoned areas of the Denny Triangle, while Alternative 2 omits these</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
<p>distinctive physical and/or historic character; and</p> <p>c. Provide transition to the edges of Downtown to complement the physical form, features and landmarks of the areas surrounding Downtown.</p> <p>Height Limits</p> <p>Policy DT-UDP5 Prescribe for all areas of Downtown specific height limits that reflect topographic conditions and a strong relation to the street pattern and the overall urban form of Downtown and adjacent areas. Use the following criteria in determining appropriate height limits and provisions for limited additions or exceptions:</p> <p>a. Transition. Generally taper height limits from an apex in the office core toward the perimeter of Downtown, to provide transitions to the waterfront and neighborhoods adjacent to Downtown.</p> <p>b. Existing Character. Through height limits, recognize and enhance the existing scale and unique character of areas within Downtown including the retail core, office core, the Pike Place Market, Belltown, the waterfront, Pioneer Square and the Chinatown/International District.</p> <p>c. Development Regulations. Coordinate development regulations with height limits.</p> <p>d. Boundaries. Coordinate height limits & land use district boundaries.</p> <p>e. Height Above Specified Limits. Increased height beyond the limits specified for Downtown zones may be considered only when the public purpose served by the additional height justifies higher buildings, and the height increase is generally consistent with the criteria above.</p> <p>Building Scale</p> <p>Policy DT UDP6 Employ development standards that guide the form and arrangement of large buildings to reduce shadow and wind impacts at the street level, promote a human scale, and maintain a strong physical relationship with the pedestrian environment. In areas where consistency of building form is important to maintaining an identifiable character and function, regulate building bulk to integrate new and existing development.</p> <p>Limit the bulk of tall buildings in residential areas to provide for light, air and views at street level and reduce the perceived scale of the buildings</p> <p>Vary development standards to reduce impacts of large-scale buildings by district consistent with the</p>	<p>£</p> <p>£</p>		<p>£</p> <p>£</p>	<p>increases, and Alternative 3 calls for different, lower height limits. Alternative 1 thus represents a greater extension of the taller, bulkier urban character of buildings in the core of Downtown to the northern edge of Downtown, and therefore less transition than proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3.</p> <p>Same response as above.</p> <p>Similar to the responses above, Alternative 1 proposes the greatest extension of a taller, bulkier character away from the Downtown core. Alternatives 2 and 4 propose no change in the DMC zones in Denny Triangle. Alternative 3 proposes more modest zoning changes intended to provide a greater residential emphasis in portions of the Denny Triangle.</p>

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
desired scale and development pattern in the area.				
<u>Major New Downtown Open Spaces</u>				
Policy DT-OSP2 Support the addition of major new public open spaces to the Downtown open space network to meet the needs of Downtown's growing employment and residential populations...Open space projects to be considered for potential development in the future include the following: <u>Westlake Circle.</u> To provide a formal Downtown terminus of West-lake Avenue and complement the special character desire for this potential boulevard; and to better integrate the retail core with the Denny Triangle neighborhood, by locating public open space in the area bounded by Stewart Street, Olive Way, 5 th and 6 th Aves.		L		The alternatives include different zoning for the Westlake Circle site, but do not include proposals for open space at this site. Alternative 1 proposes an increase in FAR from 10 to 14; Alternative 2 proposes an increase to 13 FAR; and Alternatives 3 and 4 would not change the allowable density at the Westlake Circle site.
<u>Green Streets</u>				
Policy DT-OSP4 Accommodate active and passive pedestrian space on portions of existing street rights-of-way designated as Green Streets...In residential areas, generally develop Green Streets to reinforce neighborhood character...In office and mixed use areas, improve Green Streets to provide a focus for new development and add open space for the enjoyment of workers, residents, and shoppers. Encourage interesting street level uses and pedestrian amenities to enliven the Green Street space and lend a special identity to the surrounding area.	L			Encouraging future development would encourage the achievement of pedestrian/open space improvements (such as Green Streets) in the affected areas, consistent with neighborhood plans. See the Land Use section for further discussion of open space impacts.
<u>Neighborhood Livability</u>				
Policy DT-HP7 In addition to providing for housing, pursue strategies to enhance the livability of Downtown for existing residents and to provide a high quality neighborhood environment to attract future residents, including encouraging, as appropriate, the location of public school facilities within or easily accessible to Downtown.	L	L		The alternatives were defined as regulatory changes that would support neighborhood plan goals for achieving additional housing in the Denny Triangle and Commercial Core neighborhoods. The alternatives are generally consistent with the objective of achieving livable high-quality neighborhoods.
<u>Commercial Core Goals and Policies</u>				
These goals and policies represent the Commercial Core's Neighborhood Plan, as expressed in the City's Comprehensive Plan beginning on Page NP-99.				
Goal COM-G1 Maintain the Commercial Core as a major employment center, tourist and convention attraction, shopping magnet, residential neighborhood, and regional hub of cultural and entertainment activities.	L			The alternatives generally reinforce the designation of the Commercial Core as the central employment center, tourist/convention attraction, cultural/entertainment center, with retail and residential uses. Alternatives 1-3 would accommodate future development to a higher height and density, which may encourage redevelopment of some sites in this area.
Goal COM-G2 Promote a unique neighborhood identity for the Commercial Core.	L			
Policy COM-P1 Explore revising public benefit bonuses and incentive programs regulated by the Land Use Code to stimulate desirable development	L			Bonuses and TDR programs were altered by code changes in 2001. The proposed changes in zoning would represent an

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
and support neighborhood goals.				additional incentive for future development.
Policy COM-P2 Encourage variety in architectural character and building scale.	£			The proposed zoning changes would tend to encourage variety in building scale and architectural character, as would Design Review processes for future development.
Policy COM-P5 Guide development and capital projects throughout the entire Downtown area through development of a unified urban design strategy that provides a vision for new public facilities, waterfront connections, pedestrian environments, transit linkages and open space.		£		The alternatives to increase allowable height and density are only peripherally related to the objectives of this policy.
Policy COM-P6 Strive to take advantage of opportunities to develop new public open space and encourage development of a system of connected green spaces and open public areas.		£		The alternatives do not explicitly address parks and open spaces, but neighborhood plans and code requirements address required and envisioned park/open space improvements. See the Pedestrian Amenities/Open Space discussion in this EIS
Policy COM-P7 Use Green Streets and open space as a means to improve urban design character and provide amenities that support growth.		£		Same response as above.
Denny Triangle Goals and Policies				
Goal DEN-G2 A mixed-use neighborhood that combines commercial office space, retail sales and services, social and public services, and a residential population.	£			The alternatives are generally consistent with this goal.
Policy DEN-P4 Consider a variety of land use tools, including increased height limits and floor area ratios, design review processes, bonuses for public benefit features and exempting housing and retail space from floor area ratio to stimulate both residential and commercial development.	£			The alternatives directly respond to this goal and policy of the Denny Triangle Neighborhood Plan. The proposed height and density increases are intended to aid in stimulating future residential and commercial development. Other recent proposals have included changes to Downtown-related bonus and TDR provisions of the Land Use Code.
Policy DEN-P5 Encourage a mix of low, moderate and market rate affordable housing throughout the neighborhood, incorporated into projects that mix commercial and residential development within the same projects.	£			The proposed Land Use Code changes are intended to stimulate provision of mixed-use housing serving several household income levels. See the Housing section of this EIS for further discussion of impacts.
Policy DEN-P6 Support creation of "residential enclaves" of predominantly residential development along key green street couplets at 9 th and Terry Avenues and Bell and Blanchard Streets identifiable as residential neighborhoods by small parks, improved streetscapes, retail functions and transportation improvements that support neighborhood residents and employees alike.	£			The alternatives relate to this policy in different ways. Alternatives 2 and 4 propose no changes in the DMC zones at 9 th and Terry Avenues. Alternative 1 proposes the largest increase in height and density at this location, and Alternative 3 suggests rezoning this vicinity as a way to more directly support the residential enclave concept of the Denny Triangle neighborhood plan.
Goal DEN-G3 A diverse, mixed use character that	£			The alternatives are generally consistent

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
provides a transit and pedestrian-friendly atmosphere.				with this goal. Alternative 1 proposes the greatest increase in allowable height and density to promote this goal.
Policy DEN-P9 Encourage the creation of new open spaces, including at Westlake Circle and at the Olive/Howell wedge.		£		The alternatives do not explicitly address parks and open spaces. See the Open Space section for further discussion.
Policy DEN-P10 Encourage the creation of open space as part of new public projects.		£		This policy has little relationship to the alternatives.
Policy DEN-P11 Support redevelopment of Westlake Boulevard as a boulevard.		£		Future development under any of the alternatives may help encourage improvements to Westlake Boulevard.
Policy DEN-P12 Designate and support the development of green streets in the neighborhood.	£	£ ?		Encouraging future development would encourage the achievement of pedestrian/open space improvements (such as Green Streets) in the affected areas, consistent with neighborhood plans.
Policy DEN-P13 Strive to accomplish goals for open space as defined for urban center villages, such as: 1 acre of Village Open Space per 1,000 households All locations in the village must be within approximately 1/8 mile of Village Open Space; Dedicated open space must be at least 10,000 square feet in size, publicly accessible and usable for recreation and social activities; There should be at least one usable open space of at least one acre in size where the existing and target households total 2,500 or more; One indoor, multiple use recreation facility; One dedicated community garden for each 2,500 households in the Village, with at least one dedicated garden site.		£		The alternatives to increase allowable height and density are only peripherally related to the objectives of this policy. See the Open Space section for further discussion.
Belltown Goals and Policies				
Goal B-G4 A neighborhood with a mixed-use character with an emphasis on residential and small business activity.	£		£	The alternatives propose different height and density changes for an edge of Belltown. Alternative 1 proposes the greatest level of change (3 FAR and an additional 100 feet); Alternatives 2 and 4 propose no changes from existing zoning; and Alternative 3 suggests zoning that would better support provision of housing (with ground-floor retail uses).
Policy B-P1 Seek to preserve the existing neighborhood scale and character by developing tools that both encourage the retention of existing buildings and encourage the creation of a variety of new small scale buildings.	£		£	Same response as above.
Policy B-P16 Promote human-scaled architecture, particularly ground level retail uses.	£		£	Same response as above.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLANS AND POLICIES

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
KING COUNTY GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING COUNCIL: COUNTYWIDE PLANNING POLICIES				
<p><i>Community Character and Open Space</i></p> <p>FW-26 Significant historic, archaeological, cultural, architectural and environmental features shall be respected and preserved.</p>	£			Current City regulations protect significant historic, archaeological, cultural, architectural and environmental features. See the Land Use and Urban Design sections of this EIS for further discussion.
<p><u>Historic Resources</u></p> <p>CC-2 All jurisdictions shall encourage land use patterns and implement regulations that protect and enhance historic resources, and sustain historic community character.</p>	£			The alternatives would generally encourage the preservation of existing historic districts by directing new Downtown development to the study area. However, some historic resources within the study area could be affected by redevelopment. Regulations are in place to protect designated landmarks. See the Land Use and Urban Design sections of this EIS for further discussion.
SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE SEATTLE				
<p><i>Cultural Resources Element</i></p> <p>CR11 – Identify and protect landmarks and historic districts that define Seattle's identity and represent its history, and strive to remove barriers to preservation. As appropriate, offer incentives for rehabilitating and adapting historic buildings for new uses.</p>	£			The City has identified landmarks and historic districts within the study area. Incentives are available to preserve landmarks and districts. See the Land Use section for more information.
<p><i>Downtown Urban Center Goals and Policies</i></p> <p>Goal DT-UPD1 Encourage the preservation, restoration, and re-use of individual historic buildings and groupings of buildings threatened by development pressure through development regulations and incentives.</p>	£			See the response to CC-2, above.
<p><i>Commercial Core Goals and Policies</i></p> <p>Policy COM-P3 Strive to maintain the neighborhood's historic, cultural and visual resources.</p>	£			See the response to CC-2, above

PUBLIC VIEW PROTECTION PLANS AND POLICIES

Plan/Policy	Consist.	Neutral	Not Consist.	Alternatives' Relationship to Plans/Policies
CITY OF SEATTLE'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: TOWARD A SUSTAINABLE SEATTLE				
<p><i>Downtown Urban Center Goals and Policies</i></p> <p><u>View Corridor Setbacks</u></p> <p>Policy DT-UDP9 Require setbacks on specified segments of designated view corridors where there is potential for maintaining a scope of view wider than the street right-of-way from uphill areas as redevelopment occurs. On sites abutting these street segments, require setbacks of the upper portions of buildings to allow for a wider view corridor than would occur if development extended to the street property line. Adjust the height and depth of these setbacks in relation to topography to balance multiple objectives of providing a pedestrian-oriented building base integrated with the established development pattern, maintaining a wide scope of view, and minimizing impacts on the development potential of abutting properties where setbacks are required.</p>		£		<p>This policy requests view corridors along more streets and greater lengths of streets than locations currently defined in the Land Use Code for view corridor setbacks. The policy relates to views down the existing street corridors, also referring to setback concepts for buildings. All of the defined corridors in this Plan are Streets oriented toward Elliott Bay, not Avenues. In the study area for this EIS, the additional requested view corridors include all streets from Pike Street south to S. King Street, extending essentially to I-5. Existing view corridors in the Commercial Core extend westward from 3rd Avenue.</p> <p>Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 relate to this policy in the same fashion because the proposed changes in the DOC 1 zone are the same. None of the alternatives inherently make an extended view corridor more, or less, feasible to implement.</p>
<p><i>Belltown Goals and Policies</i></p> <p>Policy B-P19 Maintain designated view corridors.</p>		£		<p>This policy has a similar motivation to the Downtown Urban Center policy above, but in relation to the Belltown area. The EIS alternatives generally have little overlap with the intended view corridors in Belltown, or Belltown's existing view corridors in the Land Use Code. For the affected area at the southern Belltown edge, Alternative 1 would have the greatest effect in increasing allowable height and density, and Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 would essentially not increase height or bulk allowances. None of the alternatives would inherently impact the preservation of view corridors along streets in the Belltown vicinity.</p>